



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,419	12/03/2003	Satoshi Egawa	117183	8787
25944	7590	01/23/2009	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			RILEY, MARCUS T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/23/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/725,419	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EGAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MARCUS T. RILEY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MARCUS T. RILEY. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) John Backenstose. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2009.

Type: a)  Telephonic b)  Video Conference  
c)  Personal [copy given to: 1)  applicant 2)  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bruce (US 6,678,064), Nakatina (US 4,806,978), Yellepeddy et al. (US 6,288,790).

Agreement with respect to the claims f)  was reached. g)  was not reached. h)  N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presentated his position on the claimed invention. Ways to overcome the prior art were discussed. Applicant's representative specifically stated that its not obvious to combine Bruce '064 with Nakatina '978 and lacks sufficient motivation. The examiner will formally consider the proposed position of the applicant by taking a more indebt look at the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Marcus T Riley/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625